

**MINUTES**  
**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**October 4, 2006**  
**County Administration**  
**Port Huron, Michigan**

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

**Present**

Carmine Palombo, Chairman  
Robert Slattery, Vice-Chairman  
David Bee, Member  
Jerry Richards, Member  
Kirk Steudle, Member  
Susan Mortel, Member

Howard Heidemann, Member  
Steve Warren, Member  
Eric Swanson, Member  
Bill McEntee, Member  
Frank Kelley, Commission Advisor

**Staff Present**

Rick Lilly- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Stacey Schafer- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Ron Vibbert- Bureau of Transportation Planning

**Absent**

Spencer Nebel, Member

**Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 P.M.

The Council acknowledged both Mike Latuszek and Howard Heidemann for all of their work in setting up this month's Council meeting.

**Approval of August 2, 2006 Minutes**

**Mr. Bee moved for the approval of the August minutes, supported by Mr. McEntee. Motion carried.**

**Correspondence and Announcements**

None

## **Agency Reports**

Mr. Palombo reported on the National Scan presentation that was held in Detroit. Representatives from a number of different states, along with the Federal Highway Administration were in attendance. Mr. Palombo gave a presentation on behalf of the Council, as well as SEMCOG. Mr. Warren also gave a presentation on what Kent County was doing about asset management. The feedback was very good, and they were very impressed with where the Council is at right now. Mr. Warren thought it was a good exchange, and there was good dialog throughout the day. There were a lot of questions about what we are trying to do. There was some surprise in the collaboration of the different levels of government attempting to try to understand a system that is as complex as asset management. Mr. Steudle stated that Michigan's chapter is being written last. At the end of the month, AASHTO will have some sort of draft report and maybe by the next Council meeting there will be something to report on this.

Mr. Steudle reported that he and Mr. McEntee are on a NCHRP committee, that is looking at developing an asset management process for the interstate system

## **Quarterly Report**

Mr. Lilly handed out the quarterly report, all questions and concerns were addressed.

## **Approval of Work Program Priorities**

Mr. Lilly stated that when the work program was done initially some of the groups listed priorities and some did not. An email was sent out to members to prioritize for the remaining items. A list of responses were tabulated and averaged out.

**Mr. Bee made a motion to approve the Work Program priorities, supported by Ms. Mortel. Motion carried.**

## **Approval of Center for Geographic Information 2006-2007 Work Activities**

Mr. Lilly stated that each Council member should have received the Center for Geographic Information's (CGI) work activities. Mr. Swanson indicated that the work plan has been a product of the last couple of years and has been refined to be able to be displayed as a work schedule for the year. Mr. Swanson stated that the decision was made to keep the Reporting Tool live and that is reflected in the work activities.

Mr. Swanson informed the Council that these are the changes that the Data Management Committee and Model Analysis Team (MAT) have indicated that they want done. Mr. Lilly stated that CGI's contract expires at the end of next

year and the Council needs to keep this in mind when approving these work activities.

**Mr. Warren moved to approve CGI's 2006-2007 Work Activities, supported by Mr. Steudle. Motion carried.**

#### **Approval of Changes to Internet Investment Reporting Tool**

Mr. Swanson indicated that the fall 2006 improvements were developed through the Data Management Committee and MAT.

Mr. Lilly stated that the Council has set a deadline for February 1<sup>st</sup> for when data has to be submitted for the next year. With some of these changes, this is not logical because we would have train more people. Mr. Lilly would like to go back to the June 1<sup>st</sup> date, as it was this year, and give the agencies a little more time. Mr. Warren wants to look at some options. Mr. Lilly stated that we could make it April 1<sup>st</sup>; this reinforces the issue that we need to get the data in.

**Mr. Warren moved approval of the changes on the Internet Investment Reporting Tool and moving the reporting date to April 1<sup>st</sup> as the deadline for the agencies to file information, supported by Mr. Slattery. Motion carried.**

#### **Approval of Additional Funds for RoadSoft**

Mr. Lilly asked Terry McNinch to look at where their budget stood for the remainder of the year. He indicated that they have used up the \$140,000 and now need additional funds. Mr. Lilly is asking the Council for an additional \$24,500 to get RoadSoft through the end of the year, recognizing that they will need these additional funds the following year, as well.

Mr. McNinch stated that the model developer support is what has taken up a large portion of the funds. There were five tasks (costs) that went along with this item. Mr. McNinch explained each of these costs to the Council.

**Mr. Warren moved approval of an additional \$24,500 for RoadSoft, supported by Mr. Richards. Motion carried.**

#### **Report and Recommendation from the Conference Planning Committee**

Mr. Lilly handed out a copy of this report to each of the Council members. The committee has recommended that we hold two conferences next year, one in the Upper Peninsula and one in the Lower Peninsula. The committee recommends

that both conferences should cover the same material and held around the same time that the conference was this year.

Mr. Lilly recommends that the Council do two conferences that are not similar in content, rather do some sort of workshop in the Upper Peninsula. Mr. Lilly is concerned that having two conferences would create logistic problems in trying to do two of the exact same conferences. Mr. Lilly recommends that the Council have a similar conference, like the one this year, in the Lower Peninsula, and have a workshop in the Upper Peninsula.

Mr. Steudle feels that the conferences need to take on some sort of workshop, along with the actual conferences. Mr. Steudle is supportive of doing a workshop in both the Lower Peninsula and Upper Peninsula. The Council needs to come to some sort of consensus today in order to begin arranging this conferences/workshop. Mr. Warren agrees with Mr. Steudle, and thinks that we need to keep on doing the “how-to” aspect of asset management. The big question is “who do we need to get too?”

Mr. Slattery is in favor of doing two conferences, similar in content, one upstate and one downstate. Marquette is central in the U.P and would gain a lot of participation. This would be a good place to hold the U.P conference.

Mr. McNinch indicated that there are keynote speakers that are already in the U.P. these resources can be used.

**Mr. Steudle made a motion to charge the planning committee with coming up with two conferences next year, dates are to be determined based on availability. One is to be held in the Upper Peninsula and one in the Lower Peninsula, they are to be comparable to each other. Charge the Planning Committee to come back to the Council with how to make this all work, supported by Mr. Slattery. Motion carried**

### **Discussion on RoadSoft Activities for 2007**

Mr. Lilly handed out a list of activities that was sent to him by Mr. McNinch. Mr. McNinch needs some guidance so that he can put together a work authorization for 2007. The Council needs to give recommendations to him so that he can come back to the next Council meeting with his work authorizations. We are on a tight timeframe in order to get this done by January 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Lilly would like to have the comments from the Council as soon as possible.

Mr. Warren would feel comfortable with Mr. McNinch giving the Council his recommendations and budget for the activities. Mr. McNinch wants to know what the Council does not want to do so that time is not wasted. Mr. Lilly recommended that if the Council feels comfortable with Terry's list then he can go ahead and put together a budget for it and bring it to the Data Committee for a

Council recommendation. The Council wants Mr. McNinch to develop a draft budget, and then go to the Data Committee for review and recommendation for the Council at the November 1<sup>st</sup> Council meeting.

### **Update on PASER Data Collection: Federal-aid and Local Roads**

Mr. Lilly handed out the update on PASER. Mr. Lilly went over the agencies that had submitted their data so far. CGI is now doing the quality control (QC) checks, they have sent out some guidelines for all of the MPO's and regions to run their own check before they send it in.

The other information that was handed out to the Council contained some errors that the Council was still getting from some of the data submitted. They are doing some checks, and running some maps that are still be analyzed and looked at by staff to determine what we are seeing. One of the things that we are thinking about doing is allowing CGI to make some changes that were simply data entry errors and not analysis errors. The Council thought this to be a good idea if it was not a significant change, this would help in the progress.

Data Collection is going very well. Most of the problems that we have had have been in training raters and the problem was that the person went to the training, and then left for school or for other reasons and is no longer working there. Mr. McNinch, and his staff, came up with a good way to do training. They have done some online and teleconferencing training. There were a couple of problems with equipment and scheduling conflicts. One of the best things that have happened is that we are not going to be held to the Framework. Using Framework 5, and not having to rush to get it into the RoadSoft and laptop data collector has worked out just fine. Next year they are going to use Framework version 6, they are not going to have to wait to get everything going which means we are going to get training and everything else done earlier. Everything seems to be going very smoothly.

Mike Latuszek, from St. Clair County Metro Planning Commission, reported that things went really well for them this year. They had some problems with staff getting trained and then leaving last year, but they did not run into this type of problem this year.

Dr. Drummer's analysis was handed out on quality control and his recommended plan, which is a significant change from the 1% we are doing now. Some direction of the Council is needed. Dr. Drummer feels that the fundamental reason that we are getting the big changes is systematic and the raters are seeing different things. It is not based upon the segments; it's based upon the difference between raters and quality control. He also points out that you can not do a comparison by the teams because we do not have enough data. This would require a county by county analysis and we do not have enough data. We can do it by regions, by not by teams. If the Council does want us to do this, it would be

a significant cost on Mr. Vibbert's staff and Chan Singh's time because it would require him to drive more miles than he is right now.

Mr. Lilly would like to try this approach out in a region and not necessarily have it done by Mr. Sigh. Mr. McEntee agrees with Mr. Lilly that we should, in the next couple of weeks, have someone try Dr. Drummer's approach on one region. The Council is interested in seeing what benefits this approach has, on a smaller scale. As soon as a decision is made, internally, the Council has instructed staff to go ahead and implement their decision.

Regarding the collection of PASER data on Local Roads, notices were sent out about being able to reimburse agencies for their data. As of now we have not gotten anyone who is willing to just give us their data. 9 agencies, 7 counties, and 2 cities have registered. Over 2,200 miles are registered to be rated, or about \$25,800 that we would be reimbursed. The counties are Alpena, Oscoda, Muskegon, Genesee, Otsego, Oceana, and Lenawee. The cities are Adrian and Portage. Portage will be done this week and Alpena is done. Genesee has started their process as well.

### **Report from the Model Analysis Team**

Mr. Lilly indicated that the work from this committee has been very significant.

Mr. Lilly handed out the data that is necessary as inputs in the RoadSoft model. From there MAT looked at what they had from the trunkline and what they had from the local, they have identified where the source of that data comes from and who has responsibility for seeing that Michigan Tech has that information to run in the model. On the trunkline system we do not have pavement type after fix, or the number of lane miles of fix. In the run that they are beginning to do this month, a number of assumptions were made on pavement type after fix and lane miles of fix. That information should start to become available to us through the Investment Reporting Database. The bigger problem is the lack of complete data on the local system. The reason that there is a partial indicated is because we do not have complete compliance with people reporting. We only have a number of agencies who have reported, so we don't have everything in and that is why it is partial. We have not had anyone go through the data that is reported in the investment tool yet and determine whether or not we have accurate data.

We need to focus on closing these gaps. At the Data Management Committee, at the end of this month, the committee will see a run from RoadSoft, it will be trunkline only using 2004-2005 PASER data and the 2005 reporting cost data. Also, there will be runs from the bridge condition forecasting system as well. We are moving ahead with some runs, but we have some significant gaps in order to make this model do everything it's suppose to be able to do.

Mr. Warren asked what the game plan is for going through the data base, and determining to what extent, on the local system you could turn those partials into yeses? Mr. Lilly indicated that was an issue that was going to be brought back to the Data Management Committee meeting to talk this out and get some ideas on how to do this.

### **Discussion: Supplemental Report to State Transportation Commission/Legislature**

This item was held over for the November Council meeting.

### **Discussion on PA 328: Local Reporting Process Pilot**

Mr. Lilly indicated that we have not done anything, in terms of the pilot yet. Mr. Lilly and staff met with MDOT's Finance and Government Affairs staff to talk about the reporting process pilot that was part of Act 328. The section states that you have to have an approved asset management plan on file in order to do this. There are only four cities in the state that have done this. The first thing that we have to do is to get more cities to do an asset management plan and getting them on file.

The group that met was very comfortable with the idea of working with the Council, and letting them take the lead on it if they wanted to. There are a number of difficult hurdles that would have to be overcome, and they are the same ones that we faced when we set up our reporting process. The biggest one is that there are various reporting dates. The largest agencies in the state have fiscal years from October 1-September 30<sup>th</sup>, while the vast majority tend to be July 1-June 30<sup>th</sup>. It would require a lot of money and work at local agencies to change all of their reporting processes. Another hurdle is the numbers that we need in a reporting process combined are very different. The Council is program oriented, Act 51 is accountant oriented. None of the people that met thought that these tasks were impossible. The Finance staff is very interested in the Council's Internet Reporting Tool. It would probably take 1-2 years to get the whole thing done because of working out all the kinks. The group felt it was worth doing. At this time, it does not include the counties, and this is a concern. There was no decision at all where to go with this until the Council has made its recommendation.

Mr. Palambo suggested that a letter be sent out to the four cities that have an AM process in place and allow them to go ahead with this pilot if they would like too.

### **Public Comment**

Mike Latuszek. stated that the training for PASER was very good.

Rich Mangus, from Madison Heights, inquired about the asset management process and how to set this up. Mr. Lilly instructed Mr. Mangus how to do this and where to submit it.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 P.M